

JPRS 76389

9 September 1980

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1062

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

9 September 1980

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
No. 1062

CONTENTS

NATIONAL

Limitations on Local Initiative, Independence Hamper Agriculture (Ivan Vasil'yev; various sources, various dates).....	1
Struggle of Local Initiative Disincentives To Improve Production Central Interference in Local Affairs	
'Reactionary' Nature of Judaism Attacked (M. Gol'denberg; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 18 Jul 80).....	40

NATIONAL

LIMITATIONS ON LOCAL INITIATIVE, INDEPENDENCE HAMPER AGRICULTURE

Struggle of Local Initiative

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 May 80 p 2

[Article by Ivan Vasil'yev: "A Plan and Life"]

[Text] In Maksatikha, a rayon center in Kalininskaya Oblast, a public committee has been created for the Mologa. The Mologa River is becoming dangerously shallow, and water is disappearing from village wells. To avoid being without water, the Maksatikhites started to put up dams on the tributaries. They put up seven and stopped. More precisely, they were stopped.

In Kalinin, oblast organizations worked out a program document entitled "Scheme of Development of Reclamation and Opening Up of Lands of Kalininskaya Oblast." Its intention is to solve on a scientific basis and at a high technical level land and water problems on the scale of the oblast, especially by the end of the present century to build a thousand accumulator-ponds, that is, small reservoirs whose chief purpose would be irrigation and whose secondary purpose would be to serve as fish-breeding water bodies and as a rest zone.

The authors of the "scheme" oppose the initiative of the Maksatikhites, looking upon it as a primitive and amateurish effort interfering with the planned scientific transformation of the lands. The Mologa committee rationally declared that a thousand ponds could in no way satisfy 12,000 villages, that the one did not interfere with the other because the ponds are being built at dried out springs and gullies, while we are raising the water level of small rivers, which villages need acutely now rather than at the end of the century. Higher-ranking organs entered the argument, a swirl of papers soared back and forth.

We shall not go into technical, economic and other details; the subject of our discussion is of another kind, namely, the interrelations of the "scheme" and "independent endeavor," that is, directives and initiatives.

It would seem clear that an initiative feeds a directive, while the directive provides room for initiative. The broadest of schemes can in no way encompass, reflect or program the tremendous diversity of life. To

attempt to suppress, forbid independent endeavor means to stifle in man initiative, the desire to improve his land and his life himself, to stop his creative growth, to inflict a blow to the feeling inculcated in him of being master of his country. The program-scheme itself can only serve as a guarantee against failure when the masses take part in the creation and implementation of it actively and consciously with maximum personal interest.

Still it sometimes happens in life that the scheme does not tolerate the proximity of independent endeavor, which is born of it, but which it still denies. Long before the appearance of the above-mentioned "scheme," kol-khozes used to make reservoirs on their own because of operational necessity. The "scheme" reflected the need, selected the best experience, but, I repeat, it is unable to accomplish everything at once everywhere, which means that people are unable to stop without damage to themselves and to the general cause of self-endeavor.

Whoever has lived in the country, let us say for the past thirty years, knows how many such schemes there have been! Peat pots were made everywhere, orchards were planted at each kolkhos, rye was cut for silage, clover was plowed up, villages came to be shown on maps, the private cow was forced out of the household, small farms were closed down, agrocities were erected, and so on and so forth. Each of them was later rejected, not considering the incurred losses, without looking for the guilty parties. But nothing happens without a trace. Failures and reverses were reflected in the social activity of the farmer.

An attentive examination of the aforesaid schemes discloses their primary and initial property--the attribution of decisive significance to a particular question, confusing occasionally the consequence with the cause. Let us take a look at the plan of new resettlement, the so-called scheme of rayon planning. In Rzhevskiy Rayon, two-thirds of the villages have been declared to be without promise and marked for demolition. Yet each of them was "set up" by virtue of economic necessity, putting it simply, by grain which comes from the earth. Consequently, the earth becomes the basic element, the cause and resettlement--a derivative consequence.

To determine on paper what village should exist and what village should not without taking into consideration the question whether the land without the village will produce more grain (not the same amount, but namely more for in this is to be found the aim and sense of all the changes) means to act ignorantly without thinking of the consequences in a fully responsible manner. "The fact is that a single solution for the different spheres of farming in all the regions of a tremendous country simply does not exist. Only one thing is clear: there can never be any success where people sit with folded arms awaiting instructions on any questions from above. And, conversely, if people boldly take affairs in hand, allow room for initiative, take advantage of worthwhile beginnings, success is assured," L.I. Brezhnev said at a pre-election meeting of the voters of Baumanskiy Electoral District.

Initiative and the scheme. The latter appears most frequently as an order and less frequently as a recommendation. And if it should be an order, then it is immediately followed by prohibitory measures. The rayon planning scheme should be a recommendation, but it has preferred to exist as an injunction and as prohibitions: unprojected constructions were not to be built, production facilities to be curtailed, capital not to be invested, the sphere of services to be reduced...

A surprising paradox emerges: the scheme, pursuing a single sacred aim--the well-being of the people, creates with these very same prohibitory measures and their consequences inconveniences and difficulties for the people. Take the water and land program worked out in Kalinin, which prohibits the Maksatikhites from putting up dams on small rivers, creates difficulties for many villages: how do you live if the spring or the well has no water? Yet the objective is the common good: irrigation, fish, microclimate, recreation. Or, for example, the technological scheme for flax pulling. In the oblast, a single technology has been adopted: flax-pulling with combines with simultaneous deseeding of the flax bolls. This finally resulted in an absence of high-quality seeds. The chairman of Kolkhoz imeni V.I. Lenin M.Ye. Golubev decides on doing harvesting without deseeding, but this requires flax thrashers, which cannot be purchased because the injunction removed them from production. But the most surprising thing of all in the flax story is that one of the scheme's authors went to the Netherlands and saw that there the flax boll is not immediately deseeded; he then began to propagandize the foreign experience at home, forgetting in this connection that Tver' flaxgrowers have been doing this through the centuries. Truly one has to become more foreign than the foreigner to forget the experience of one's forefathers.

The scheme-injunction aspires to infallibility. But in agricultural production there can be no single technological solutions since the conditions under which flax, grain or potatoes are cultivated differ in the extreme. They oblige the farmer to have in reserve different alternatives, which at times can be quite dissimilar from the generally accepted one.

Of course, the scheme reflects a timely need, a principal tendency and, as such, it puts pressure on lagging elements and speeds up their progress. In this capacity, it must be patient and extremely discerning. But it is often lacking in patience. It is inescapably accompanied by a campaign law: as fast as possible! It worships adoption pacemakers and is not very demanding in regard to results. From this weakness, another emerges: it does not like to look for those at fault and make them accountable--it suffers from all-forgiveness.

In conflicting situations, which the process of execution of the scheme is full of, it is very important to see which or what interests serve as the motive power of people's acts, the cause of their initiative or passivity.

Let us take a more recent example--specialization in field-crop cultivation. In our parts, it has consisted so far of shifting of crops: on one farm, they "push" flax, freed from potatoes, on others, the converse, potatoes, on freeing from flax. The replanning of crops can be done in a day, but years are required to prepare the conditions. On a number of farms, they are unable to "take" a double portion and thus begin to "launder": the report shows one thing, the fields another. There are many such cases.

Officially, the maneuvers of such farms are considered as eyewash, but actually in the absolute mass, it is nothing but a forced initiative in the collective interest.

A manager embarks on a surreptitious maneuver intended for the advantage of the collective (of a kolkhoz or sovkhos), which, as a rule, is to the benefit of society. Doing something secretly, on one's own, perhaps is frequently a most widespread form involving the struggle of self-initiative and the scheme, a completely internal dramatic action. Were there no such hidden resistance, the scheme would that much sooner disclose its unsoundness. But the point is that it is impossible for it "not to be," since the collective interest and defense of one's cause give rise to an outflanking maneuver. And the struggle tends to drag out for a rather long time. Let us again dwell on the rayon planning scheme. Despite prohibitions, here and there dwelling houses and cow barns have been put up in nonpromising villages, but in the reports "on collective settlement" they inserted some kinds of escheated huts, while "above" they thought that some sort of progress was taking place, and that it should be continued in this spirit. Especially since the actual process of concentration of the population is objective, the economy puts a cross on unneeded small homesteads so that it is not the idea of the scheme that is unsound but rather the scale and the methods and all the prohibitory measures that are at fault.

In the final analysis, the common good prevails, but in this struggle of scheme and initiative collective interest very often fades out and loses its primary significance in the consciousness of people, yielding place to personal interest; their mutual connection is weakened, and the latter to reorient itself toward another collective that is more stable and reliable. In other words, the kolkhoz farmer, seeing how sometimes damage is done to a collective farm that contains his personal good, leaves for another collective--plant, timber-industry operation or enterprise.

I recently traveled through a number of rural areas and was heartened at how lively a pace construction was going on in the countryside. The "multi-story style" has finally been discarded; they have started to put up houses of the farmstead type. This alone unshackles initiative, since everyone knows that tremendous 3-5-story structures cannot be built by one's efforts; in the latter case they sit and wait for the arrival of their planned turn, the arrival of a contractor, who puts you up next to the sky. But five-walled cottages are quite adequate for a kolkhoz, and if not for a kolkhoz, then for the rayon. Here one can use his brains and demonstrate his

abilities. They started to do a lot of building and were happy to see new settlements, but the main thing is that the mood of the people was improved as if they had come out of a stupor; they became lively, more energetic and no longer waited for manna from heaven but rather did their own thing. One, however, is struck by such a detail: farmstead houses are built with a mass of inconveniences. The result is the following: they built according to model plans and placed the blame on uncle; we, they say, are not to blame--they gave, we cook; when they permitted us to build ourselves, it turned out we were unable to do any better. We are out of practice. We have forgotten. The people never seem to think of consulting with others, of going to their neighbors for advice, of inviting specialists. In a word, the sought-for initiative did awaken, but was in no hurry to perform its natural function of giving rise to a new quality. And if this drags out, if conditions do not contribute to its development and growth, then a voice may be expected to be heard shortly: so, you see, nothing worthwhile has come from your touted initiative. Then--a new scheme will follow. All this has happened before.

Why is the scheme so inattentive to initiative? Let us look at its inception, perhaps that is where the reason lies. The development of the economy brought with it the necessity of specialization and concentration of production. This is the main line. It must be, as they say, put into practice. Let us assume the position of a rayon official, say, the chief of a rayon agricultural administration. A directive has been issued by the oblast: work out a scheme of concentration of crops and livestock, of specialization of farms. Where should he begin? Theoretically, as follows: assemble representatives of kolkhozes, analyze the economy and convincingly prove the advantageousness and need of specialization measures. Then go to the kolkhoz for a general meeting and bring up the new plan for approval. After all, a kolkhoz cannot be ordered, it can only be given recommendations and whether the meeting accepts the plan or does not accept it will depend on the substantive content of the arguments and sober considerations of the resources and possibilities of the farm.

This is the way it should be. But it does not always happen that way. The administration chief puts specialists to work; they assemble a mound of data; they analyze, distribute, and although at times they may see that a planned figure is unrealistic, they still enter it in the appropriate column because otherwise the plan "would not work," it lacks pointedness. The specialists will work for a "beautiful plan" on paper and be least concerned as to how it would fare in practice and what the results would be, although they would not admit this to anyone. Their position is such that they do not depend on production or on the results of field and farm.

Try to tell the administration chief that he is starting from the wrong end and you will hear his perplexed reply: what do you mean from the wrong end? The thought never even entered his mind to consult, to ask people. Why? Simply because he does not know of any other methods and lacks the ability to convince. To his understanding, the staff of the administration's

specialists exists for the purpose of working out schemes and releasing them to lower echelons and not for working up recommendations and convincing with fact and organization of the production process. The source of this error lies in his accountability in only one direction--to those above him, since the administration chief very rarely has to report to the immediate executants--the peasant farmers; he therefore does not consider the fact that they may confidently ask for damages inflicted on the farm by a poorly thought out and unsubstantiated scheme.

As a result it may happen that milking machines may go out of order on an animal-husbandry farm. A specialized brigade of adjusters arrives from the rayon center; it examines them, repairs them and, on getting paid, leaves. In a week, the machines are again out of order. The brigade again arrives for more money. The milkmaids (and the kolkhoz) have to have the machines working faultlessly, and this is where their material interest is, but for the brigade of adjusters, it is the other way around--the more often they get out of order, the bigger its earnings. Such conflicts are to be found everywhere, since the scheme of servicing of production is frequently devised without taking into consideration equality of interests. Will this scheme be considered so and support all the more local initiative and the self-endeavor of the farmer? More likely not: the kolkhoz or the sovkhos tries to maintain and service equipment with its own efforts, but specialized units, also serving as fund holders, very often hinder this by not selling spare parts and create other difficulties.

Self-endeavor is motivated by interest. The director, in our case the kolkhoz chairman, is the expresser of the collective interest. In order for interest to be caught and understood, the mechanism for the manifestation and expression of the interest must work faultlessly. Such a mechanism does exist in brigade and general meetings, village assemblies, brigade councils, managing board, auditing commission and public organizations. Comments, proposals, protests, statements and complaints--all that is expressed in one way or another is summed up by the chairman and analyzed, motivating him to act. But the actions of a director do not depend solely on how correctly he understands the collective interest. One may understand but also ignore. And ignoring occurs more frequently there where a collective has less of an opportunity of making demands--not the right, but the possibility, since to have the former does not mean having the latter. I had a talk with a chairman, a long-time friend. I asked: well, you "contrived"--you secretly did not sow enough of this or that, you sowed too much in regard to other things, yet you sold everything that you should have sold and made a profit; why then was it necessary to "contrive"? Had you held a meeting, it would have approved a realistic sowing plan... He replied: "It was not allowed that way, I disregarded, should I have acknowledged?.."

This is what he said, but he evidently began to think about it: actually, why should I quail before the authorities? I was not afraid to take the "initiative" in the field, for I knew that everything would work out, but I did not dare admit it to others. The chairman then recalled that he was

the authorized representative of the collective in the rayon, not an authorized official of the rayon at the kolkhoz. Since such is the case, he thought, it means that I should refer to the collective and ask its opinion. At a reporting meeting, he stated that the plan was such and such, we sowed that much, the harvest turned out well, and all the plans were fulfilled. What should we do next time: should we again contrive or demand a review of the hectare plan? The meeting resolved: in the interest of the endeavor, to sow that much and that much and to have the rayon revise the unrealistic plan. The rayon agricultural administration admitted the rightness of the collective and changed the sowing plan in conformity with the demand.

In my opinion, the example is most eloquent. It addresses especially the fact that frequently an opinion has come to be formed imperceptibly among farm directors that the rank-and-file farmer need not be asked. And this is nothing else but the consequences of having foisted on them, and demandingly at that, poorly thought out, theoretically worked out schemes. For this reason the party again and again reminds us of the need of developing initiative and independent endeavor.

Disincentives To Improve Production

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 May 80 p 2

[Article by Ivan Vasil'yev: "Carelessness or Conservatism"]

[Text] Much is said of the Russian Nonchernozem Zone. A major interesting discussion is going on concerning the very difficult problems of the region and on the quickest and best way of fulfilling the renewal program. Naturally, eyes are first fixed on the man, his temperament, his means and readiness to carry out what has been specified. And in heated journal-newspaper discussions, writers of the "village" school, while pondering on the reasons for developmental slowdown in the countryside, frequently advance an anti-thesis--"spirit--machine." Villages, they say, are not ready to accept that which brings in its wake into the village a flood of machinery; the entire way of rural life resists the rhythm of the machine, technological discipline and the uncompromising demand of engines: submit--rule. They say that only because of this "heaps of equipment" are growing, but labor productivity is not growing.

The opinion is nothing new; its roots stretch to the ancient thesis of so-called rural conservatism. Does this way of life really stand in the way of progress? If the answer is "yes," is it temporary or permanent? Is it characteristic only of the village or is it also observed in the city?

I consider that there is nothing to argue about. The experience of past generations towers over the living. Progress is opposed by habit, the new by the old. The machine promises benefits but demands that we give up the habitual and pacifying. We obtain a benefit but lose others. There are no acquisitions without losses.

"Opposition" exists as a dialectical unity of opposites, the struggle of which is movement. And if it is an objective law, then its manifestations are also universal and inevitable.

I had a talk from this standpoint with Mikhail Yefimovich Golubev, the chairman of a kolkhoz on the Upper Volga. It has become a habit with me: as soon as I have a problem, I go to Golubev. I say: this is what has happened and such is the opinion, what do you think? He is one of those practical men who can be called "thinkers." He has an analytical frame of mind.

Golubev was reading a new issue of the oblast paper, heard me out and then said:

"Here, read. It's a report from the plenum of the oblast trade-union council. It cites facts: out of 730 kolkhozes and sovkhoses, 549 did not fulfill their plan of milk sales and 488 of meat sales. The construction people have failed to complete on schedule 400 priority projects. Every fourth industrial enterprise has not fulfilled its targets for growth of labor productivity; 32 percent of the people working are engaged in manual labor. What does all this attest to? The fact that the opposition which you refer to is by no means a rural phenomenon; it is nothing else but absence of organization, the inability to arrange things properly."

I thought that his reply was too "grounded" and lacked philosophy. Is it possible to argue in this way? One should break away, elevate oneself--and then...

"All right, let us break away. Let us say that villages do "oppose." What do you actually mean? Today the village presents an excessively complex concept. There is no perfect village. You cannot draw a line around its fence and say: this is what we mean by village and anything beyond is not a village. Our ties with the city are so wide and close that I, without sinning before truth, can bring to my kolkhoz half of the rayon center."

"But nonetheless," now it was I who was drawn to facts, "the city gives you loads of machines, but you do not use them as you should."

"That means we have to cite examples... Take, for example, a plant making the excellent Volna milking machine. The kolkhoz buys it. It does not have its own repair service. Where should it go? We all know--to Sel'khoz-tekhnika. There they say: nothing doing. Nor can I find any specialists. The milking machine lies like dead capital. Another case: the deep-well pump breaks down. We turn to Burvodstroy: an emergency, the cows have not received water, please come in a hurry. They reply: not before Monday, we have two days off; you must manage to get along somehow. We try to manage, but can the cow manage, she has no days off. Where is our resistance to progress here? We are all for progress. Providing machines is only half the job. Progress requires first a maintenance service and second--responsibility. The city has assumed the servicing end; it has assumed it but does not want to answer for the results. This is why I say: it is not opposition that bothers us, but rather organizational confusion."

"Let us say that such is the case. But look at the country people. You can't deny cases where a tractor operator does not want to master a new machine or use an old one more productively."

"I won't deny it. But the cause does not lie with him. You know German Lisitsin, the tractor operator, from the first brigade. One year he undertook to pull flax without a combine operator. One to do the job of two people--what could be better! I paid him for two. The inspectors gave me a reprimand--you are not supposed to pay more than 20 percent for combining two jobs. 'In that case,' Lisitsin said, 'let me have a combine operator.' What was the end result? The fact that it was not advantageous for a man to work more productively. Here is a most recent case. We produced good flax and overfulfilled the sales plan. I calculated that the kolkhoz workers should be paid an extra 1,020 rubles. Then the rayon agricultural administration tells me: wait, the extra pay is permitted with the existence of a free wage fund. Where do you get a free one? The fund was planned according to calculations of expenditures per hectare; who is at fault if we take in one and a half times more fiber, the harvesting has to be paid for. Here you have a second cause of 'opposition'--it is not always to your advantage to work well. It is no advantage to be the boss on your own land! It is utter nonsense, but still a fact."

Golubev referred to Lisitsin; I know him. A wonderful machine operator! To operate at the same time a tractor and flax combine by himself, when the designers provided for two, is no simple matter. Knowledge of machine and field, master of the technology of harvesting, know-how, physical strain--all of them here are at their highest degree. The result is that his "high" qualities are of no benefit to him. Is it he then who is blocking progress?

I stayed a whole week with machine operator Anatoliy Il'yushenkov of Pskovskiy Prozhektor Kolkhoz. I made a thorough study of his farm, his concerns and interests, trying to determine whether the cause of a "slowdown" was to be found truly in him, a rank-and-file farmer.

Il'yushenkov is an out-and-out farmer. He is 50 years old and began working at 12 years of age, when the war began; at sixteen he became the head of a brigade. He has gone through, as he himself says, all farming mechanization, beginning with the "half-folder" [poluslozhka], that is, a horse-drawn thresher to the Niva combine, from the GAZ-AA one-and-a-half ton truck the latest model "remletuchka" [meaning unknown]. In short, there is no machine, apparatus, or mobile repair unit at the kolkhoz, which he has not mastered. Il'yushenkov is a communist and has been awarded orders and medals for his outstanding work.

His attachment to the land he was born on is shown by the fact that in thirty years, that is, from 1946 to 1976, he put up on his old father's place three cottages. On returning from evacuation, he only found stones from the foundation. He put up the old one, five-by-six, but it soon disappeared. He bought another; it was two years in the building, but old stuff is old stuff; you use it only because you need it, and life called for something

new, he bought the framework and then for three years worked on it. Seven years went into the construction of the cottages. Why did he "break his back" all this time, when his golden hands were in demand in any city? Simply because he wanted to live on his own native land; no allurements from elsewhere attracted him. Which means that this land is his love and the source of his existence. Which means that he could in no way be indifferent to it.

But what today is the tie existing between Il'yushenkov and the land? Does he feel directly dependent on the fields? Is he drawn by the burgeoning power of the land, is the Exemplary Order on it? To answer these questions unequivocally is very much easy. Many circumstances are contributing to a weakening of the tie between the tiller of the soil and the soil itself. What is responsible for this?

First—farm expansion. To Vozhektor, which was a sound farm, weakened machinery have been added five times over a twenty-five year period. Right now Il'yushenkov not only does not know all their land but not even the people. He does not have an integrated view of the farm.

In all these years we saw no other way of resolving the fates of the depopulated, weak farms. We did not take into consideration "load norms," putting our hopes on mechanization. But even mechanized labor has its limits. Expansion with the solitary purposes of not leaving the land unmanaged in the end resulted, strange as it might seem, in a reduction of the work of man and the collective. This phenomenon is not as harmless as it might appear at first glance. It has become a hindrance in attempts at establishing a direct relationship between labor and remuneration of the farmer from the harvest. And this is how: by changing over to unregulated piecework links [kakorodnyye kuznaryadnyye even'ya] or cost-accounting brigades—this means venturing people to land they are capable of handling. Should there be a shortage of machine operators, we can forget about links. They, of course, are created, but only on paper, since all land requires human hands.

But does this mean that we are really that short in manpower that even at the present level of mechanization it is impossible to work all the land efficiently? The number of people working on the land are many. But there is the question: what do you mean by workers? On the example of Mikhail Golubev's farm, he and I calculated that the average yearly number of contractors and those "brought in" is equal to the number of the permanent workers. This means doubled manpower. But the point is that this second half, the contractors, works on the land according to its own plans; it is in no way obligated, it does not suffer nor is accountable for the end result in the fields or on the animal-husbandry farm. It is paid for the work, for the operation, but not for the result. The management is obliged to pay its own machine operator, who cannot do without contractors in the maintenance of agricultural equipment and technology, in maintaining the power supply and, finally, in the administration in such a way as to relieve him of direct dependence on yield, since in the opposite case, he would require equal responsibility and equal accountability of his partners the contractors. This is another difficulty.

I asked Il'yushenkov whether he and his comrades could "take over" the land and be wholly responsible for production. He set in particular the following condition: "The land must enjoin me, it is its main authority..."

The land enjoins... No matter how we may try to regulate the labor of the farmer, no matter what hours, rates, additions and extra payments we might devise, there is no way we can get away from the diktat of the land. Anatoly Il'yushenkov understands this with his entire being as a farmer and he submits to the call of the land. At sowing time, he rides on his mobile repair unit from dawn to dusk, and sometimes even at night, because he knows that the field will not wait and retain the moisture while you have your quota of sleep; the field demands seed, and you embed them today, for tomorrow will be too late. At harvesttime he sits on the combine--here the clock has never meant anything. You go out as soon as you can reap, and you stop when you can no longer reap. The hay must be cut when it is not raining, the cow must be taken to the field with the dew, the manure has to be taken out before the plowing, must, must, must... There is no greater authority than the authority of the earth. It has been and always will be!

"Once," Il'yushenkov said, "the chairman ordered to wake us up at three o'clock in the morning. The brigade leaders walked through the villages and knocked on the windows: get up, you have to spread the fertilizer, you have to harrow... We get up, get the tractors started... But where are the harrows? Where is the loader? While we are waiting for the harrows, while we are waiting for the loader, we look and see that it is already ten o'clock. They hassled us, hassled us, and so we fell behind. I don't need orders when to get up; just say: here is your land, grow on it such and such, and I'll take care of the rest, knowing when and what to do. Should there be something I can't figure out, I'll call the agronomist."

These words--"I'll call the agronomist"--in my opinion contain the gist of the matter: what should be the relation between the plowman and the man in charge (in the sense of the person who performs the work and the manager). Two versions, as they say, in their pure form: in the first--the plowman is boss on the field, the man in charge services him; in the second--the man in charge assumes the role of boss and manager, the plowman is left solely with the performing function. Studying the organization of production and management on our farms, you see that these two versions are intermixed in the most varied proportions. In their combinations, it must be important to find an optimum. Many years of observation permit the "drawing of a certain curve: after the first two expansion moves, brigade cost accounting began to be successfully introduced so as not to weaken the direct motivation of the worker in regard to the harvest; then conditions began to change--guaranteed monetary payment was introduced, the machine park grew, the number of fieldworkers was sharply reduced, there was a big growth of the detachment of technologists, who took over the administrative functions, and brigade cost accounting began to fade. Some time went by, however, and it became clear that a reduction had taken place in the activity and individual motivation of the rank-and-file worker--and then they started

to look for ways of balancing, on the one hand, the activity of the worker and, on the other, the responsibility of the administrator. This is how unregulated links [nezaryadnyye svyazi] appeared. But this time those same circumstances that I discussed above became a serious hindrance: first, scarcity of people (there is more land than there are people capable of working it), second, independent contractors whom it is in no way possible to link with the end result.

"See yourself in my position," Anatoliy Il'yushenkov said to me. "Here is the land which can be seen from any window. I see it when I get up, I see it when I lie down. There among those trees flax seed is being ruined. The snow fell, and they left off. Should the agronomist remember, then okay, sometime he may get around to having it threshed. Should he not be forget, it will rot. Let us say I can't wait anymore, I try to persuade the traktorists, come on, let us go and thresh it. But who will pay me? I have no authorization, no one sent one, and no one noted it anywhere. The result is as follows: I don't do what should be done, but work wherever they may send me. You understand what a pity it is: my feelings become numb, they become dried out."

It is truly a pity. A real bedrock peasant becomes a nonparticipating worker concerned only with the production norm. Social activeness is not just an empty expression but at best the fulfillment of duty. Duty is performed in the best possible manner only there where the work is organized in the best possible way. The condition of the general economy and man's activity are directly related.

Let us put the question thus: are Il'yushenkov, Lisitsyn and any other tractor operator in other relations to the land or are they perfectly satisfied with the existing ones? The fact that the present situation does not fully suit the kolhoz or society calls for no proof; it is attested by the numerous measures adopted both by the state and operational organs. But what about the farmer? It could be that he is satisfied, for there seems to be no need for him to aspire to what is greater, or is that really the case?

Thus, a meticulous study of the needs of the family and farm of Anatoliy Il'yushenkov shows that his sufficiency is only relative. Today's material position may be called sufficient compared to what he had formerly. But he has the desire for more and better.

What is the result: society needs more produce and of better quality from the land, and it provides everything necessary for this, while farmer Il'yushenkov must work better; why is it that the mutual aspirations do not produce the desired result?

It would be in place to recall Chairman Golubev: "today there is no pure village." Yes, the present village constitutes a link of the agroindustrial complex; it is so firmly ingrained that it would be an error to look at it

separately from other links not only from the economic but also from the psychological side. The ties of the village to the national-economic complex are all-encompassing. And the ties expressed in technical language constitute numerous cogwheels whose friction has to be taken into consideration because a complex, long chain, consisting of tens of links of management, services, supply, sales and an armada of all kinds of contractors has been formed between the farmer and the land, and this chain is constantly growing larger.

The end product of the land, the end result of the farmer's labor... Again and again one returns to these concepts in thinking of the components of success. These components are discussed in sufficient detail in the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Action of the Economic Mechanism on Raising Efficiency of Production and Quality of Work." Among these components is to be found strengthening of the effectiveness of economic factors and stimuli. This means that wages and material rewards must be in direct proportion to the efficiency and quality of work, the fulfillment of planned targets and the end results of productive activity.

Central Interference in Local Affairs

Moscow NASH SOVREMENNIK in Russian No 6, 1980 pp 115-135

(Article by Ivan Vasil'yev: "The Living Field, Poletnik Comments")

[Text] "Contemporary economics, politics and social life are so complex that they are subject to only the powerful collective intelligence. And it is necessary to listen to specialists and scientists, and not just of one bent or one school, and it is necessary to consult with the people in order to avoid all sorts of false "starts," premature and ill considered volitional decisions. They are particularly dangerous when you are dealing with the comprehensive economic and social-cultural development of an entire geographic region and with a long-term policy concerning it and the ability to look far ahead."

L.I. Brezhnev, "Virgin Land."

In Maksatikha, the rayon center of Kalininskaya Oblast, they decided to save the Mologa.

Mologa River gets its waters at the junction of three oblasts—Kalininskaya, Novgorodskaya and Vologodskaya--and bears them to the Volga. In the dry year of 1972, the Mologa became so shallow that water disappeared from village wells.

Like any river, the Mologa lives because of its tributaries. The tributaries are drying up. This is a common problem. Their former profusion of water is being lost by the Volga, the Dnepr and the Zapadnaya Dvina; these are great arteries that have their beginnings in our region. The Maksatikhites were the first to work on prevention of the problem. The first in the oblast; in the country there already was an example--Bryansk, which five years ago started to work on saving Desna River. Repeating the experience of the Bryanskites, they created a Mologa Public Committee in Maksatikha, which headed the construction of dams on small tributary rivers. The builders were students of the Hydroengineering Department of Kalinin Polytechnic Institute. The plans were model plans. The time periods were the practical season. The choice of place was where the old mill-dams were located. The cost of the work for each of them was 5,000 rubles, perhaps slightly more. In three years they put up seven dams, but things went no further; they stopped. More accurately, they were stopped.

Here begins the subject of our investigation: how and why was the local initiative extinguished?

My task does not include a description of all the peripeteias of the Mologa committee for the right of improving their land--this is being written about in detail and quite convincingly by newspapers--I only want to discuss the gist of the problem. Oblast organizations have worked out a "Scheme of Development of Reclamation and Opening Up of Lands of Kalininskaya Oblast," which in its intention should on a scientific basis and on a high technical level solve the problems of rational utilization of land and water on an oblast scale. In particular, the "scheme" provides for the construction over the course of ten-twelve years a thousand accumulator-ponds, that is, small reservoirs, the chief purpose of which would be irrigation and a secondary purpose--to serve as fish-breeding water bodies and as a rest zone for the local population.

This "scheme" or more precisely its creators and executors are the oblast administration of agriculture, Kaliningiprovdkhos Institute, the management of Kalininvostroy and Kaliniamelioratsiya Association; these have become an unsurmountable wall in the way of the Mologa committee. Even ministerial comrades gave in to the arguments presented by these institutions. The following paper came from the republic Ministry of Agriculture, which formerly approved and recommended for universal use the experience of the Maksatikhites, to the committee: "...At the present time..., the 'Scheme of Development of Reclamation and Opening Up of Lands of Kalininskaya Oblast,' compiled by Kaliningiprovdkhos Institute, has been approved. The performance of any work not in accordance with the aforesaid 'scheme' by nonspecialized planning and construction collectives may result in low-grade work and in the deterioration of the improved state of lands." Translated into everyday language, the answer signifies: stop, comrades, engaging in independent activity, you will only spoil our work for us.

And the construction of dams on small rivers has come to a halt...

The scheme denies independent endeavor. It denies it without considering the details. Despite the fact that in the given case there is a most significant detail: the accumulator-ponds do not apply to small rivers, for they are created at brooks, gullies, swampy spots [bolotiny]. But it still denies it, for in the understanding of its authors anything that is not written into the decision serves as a diversion from the main task, as unnecessary and even harmful amateurish work.

Let us imagine the following absurdity: in Kalininskaya Oblast there are three dramatic theaters; imagine their management, in considering the question of "entertainment coverage of the population," declaring that there is no need for artistic amateur activity. Club artists, they say, only discredit high theatrical art, waste the people's money, kill time and divert viewers to looking at trifles. Absurd? Of course. Artistic independent endeavor exists not because three theaters are in no position to take care of thirty rayons in providing them with "entertainment," it serves as the means of attracting the masses to culture and as a way of improving man, of developing and enriching his capabilities, feelings and knowledge. Moreover, theatrical art and club amateur activity are interconnected, united; one feeds the other, and their power and source of development lies in this interrelationship and unity.

It would appear that nothing could be more clear: the same relations exist between a large production program-scheme and production initiative. The broadest of schemes can in no way encompass, reflect or program the great diversity of life. It only takes a link, important, chief, decisive, but still a link. The subject of the Kalinin "scheme" (in particular) is accumulator-ponds. A thousand ponds for 12,000 villages! Do they fully resolve the problem of providing water to the population, animal-husbandry farms, workshops, boiler rooms, pasturages, vegetable gardens? No. No. This means that deepening of their little river is the job of that particular village, and, thank God, that the people assume this labor on themselves (which is the way it has been through the ages). To suppress, to forbid productive independent endeavor, means to kill in man initiative, the desire for him to improve his own life, to stop his creative development, to weaken the inculcation in him of the feeling of being master of his country --the chief aim of socialism. And even the program-scheme can be guaranteed against failure when the masses participate in its creation and implementation actively and consciously, with maximum personal motivation. The productive initiative of the masses would feed any scheme as small brooks a river.

Yet it has turned out in practice that the scheme does not tolerate independent initiative next to itself. Though hardly born, it has aspired for undivided rule.

Long before the appearance of the aforesaid "scheme," kolkhozes by their own efforts created water bodies as required by economic necessity. The "scheme" reflected the need, chose the best experience, but, I repeat, it is unable to do everything at once and everywhere, to encompass the entire

diversity of needs; this means that people cannot engage without detriment to themselves or to the general good in independent activity. Let us take a little excursion into the village's recent past.

In the winter of 1954--I was at the time the secretary of the rural territorial party organization--we were invited to a conference-seminar in the rayon. We foregathered. We see boxes standing in the midst of the hall; they contain earth, humus, mineral mixtures. Why? Have patience, they say, you'll find out presently. We found out; they were going to each us to make peat pots.

We worked on the kolkhozes till spring making this "miracle of agrotechnology," which was supposed to solve the vegetable problem in the country; we stacked them in barns--for the cold--so that with the coming of warm weather seedlings could be set out only in the pots. Somewhere halfway down the line, kolkhoz farmers became doubtful of the feasibility of the undertaking: we are not going to live on vegetables alone, they said, we have to bring manure for the potatoes, for the grain, but you can only think of peat pots. We found this conclusion reasonable and engaged ourselves in our usual peasant affairs--we began to prepare for spring. But as soon as the "report on the peat pots" found its way to the table of the authorities, we were "corrected," that is, we were told not to become diverted by "incidental affairs."

Shortly ~~spring~~ began, and there was no time for peat pots. So they remained lying in barns along with piles of manure. One still needs bread to live by.

But the scheme would not acknowledge defeat; it changed the subject: instead of vegetables, it selected fruits. "Measures for orchards" were developed. Vacant plots were chosen, plowed up, and apple trees were planted. Many were planted; subsequently they were abandoned; there was no more time for orchards, the time had arrived for the fodder problem to be solved.

Whoever has lived in our Kalinin village, let us say, for the last 30 years now ~~many~~ such schemes they had! They cut rye for silage, they planted corn, they plowed up clover...

They proposed that the ~~peasant~~ live in a multistory house, they advised that livestock should no longer be kept in sheds, that a vegetable garden should not be plowed, that sowing and harvesting be done en masse, that animal-husbandry farms put up tremendous concrete structures, that trees be cut down, that reading rooms, clubs, infirmaries and stores be centralized, that each farm should specialize and so on and so forth.

The Lord save us from saying that the present project should be allowed to take its own course. (Incidentally, "allowing things to take their own course" is a bureaucratic invention; it does not exist in nature where everything operates according to objective laws.) No, the author does not suggest denial of the scheme but rather thinking over the interaction of the scheme and self-initiative. It is essential to eventually understand the

reasons for one's own, putting it mildly, lack of success. But we are wasting time sounding a retreat today: to bring the villager down from the fifth floor to the ground, to give him a vegetable garden and a pen for his livestock; not to hurry in tearing down the village, to return to the village its tailor and shoemaker, seller and feldsher, to open up the closed sheep and pig farms, and so on, and so on... What was wrong with the past, as far as our memory is concerned--noisy program-schemes that promised so much and then quietly died away? Without finding the reasons and assimilating them, there is no sense talking of the social activity of the rural resident, of his active life position.

A thoughtful examination of these memorable schemes discloses to us their first, so to speak, initial property--to attach to a particular question a decisive importance, confusing sometimes the consequence with the cause.

Let us look at a new resettlement plan, the so-called rayon planning scheme. In Rzhavskiy Rayon, two-thirds of the villages have been declared to be nonpromising and have been listed to be turn down. But each such village was "placed" by economic necessity, putting it simply, by grain which the earth yields. Therefore, the earth is the cause and resettlement is the result. To solve on paper what village should exist and which one should not without taking into account the question whether the earth will yield more grain without the village (not as much, but namely more, inasmuch as this is the goal of all transformations) means to act to act ignorantly, without thinking with full responsibility of the consequences, since taking certain living amenities while the table is bare constitutes a dangerous and vain delusion.

The stated property of the scheme is only a potential one--it may be manifested, it may not be manifested. Everything depends on how the scheme wishes to exist: as a prescription or as a recommendation. If in the first case, then the property of being the one and only will be manifested through prohibitory measures. The scheme will barricade itself off from competition, will demand for itself undivided attention and full material support. Like an idol, it will require universal submission and praise. Only the inexorable force of objective laws is capable of sooner or later putting the "upstart" in his place.

Let us trace this on the operation of that same rayon planning scheme. It wanted to be a recommendation, but came out as a prescription. And at once--prohibitions proceeding one after the other from the rayon bosses: construction in nonpromising villages is forbidden, development of production is forbidden; all investments are to go only into central, promising settlements, life in them should be praised as though it were in paradise, while that in the "forbidden" ones--to be subjected to criticism and abuse. Find on the pages of the "rayon planner" at least one major story about life in the small household--only in minor tones: it's boring there, you use firewood for heating, they carry water in buckets, you wade through the mud from morning till night; ah, how poorly these poor orphans live! But the

"poor orphans" want to have nothing to do with the settlement of the urban type, or the fifth floor, where you do not have to fire the oven or carry water, or see a piglet born; you just sit in your chair watching performances on the television screen.

The prohibitory measures bring with them their smaller sisters: folding up, curtailment, closing down and so on. If it is not permitted to build in the villages that have been condemned to be torn down, then why worry in regard to the repair of its medical station--better board it up; why think of expanding the selection of goods in rural stores--better open two-three department-store plants for the rayon; why go from village to village with an awl or screwdriver--let the clients bring their own boots, irons, television sets to the rayon center. The service sphere has contracted and become concentrated prior to the people leaving the villages.

A surprising paradox is created: the scheme in the pursuit of its one and sacred aim--the good of the people creates with these same prohibitory measures and their consequences inconveniences and difficulties for thousands of people. Take again the water and land scheme worked out in Kalinin, refusing Maksatikhites the right to put up dams on small rivers; it multiplies difficulties for hundreds of villages: how do you live if there is no water to be found either in the well or in the brook! But the objective is universal good: irrigation, fishing, microclimate, and recreation.

Here is another scheme: flax harvesting. Today a single technology is used in Kalininskaya Oblast: flax pulling by means of combines with deseeding of bolls and their subsequent separate drying, with spreading of the straw in a band on the field. The employment of this scheme over the course of several years has resulted in uneven plant stands, irregular maturing of the bolls and a sharp deterioration in the quality of the seeds. The chairman of Kolkhos imeni V.I. Lenin Mikhail Yefimovich Golubev, analyzing the causes of such failures, came to the conclusion that the new technology neglected one extremely important detail of the centuries-old experience of flaxgrowers. The peasant occasionally did not separate the boll from the stem at once; he gave the seeds "time to arrive," to ripen in a box, and only then did he deseed and dry. The seed came out evenly in terms of strength and germinating force. Golubev tried to change the presently used scheme of harvesting--to pull the flax without simultaneous deseeding of the bolls, to dry not a heap but the sheaf and then to thresh it. But the main aspect of the operation--threshing--was blocked. It turned out that following the transition to combine harvesting flax threshes were taken off production.

The scheme-injunction aspires to infallibility; it assumes itself to be the only true solution for the problem. But in complex agricultural production there are no single technological solutions, nor could there be any since the conditions under which grain, flax, potatoes are grown are extremely varied. First and foremost they oblige the farmer to have in reserve other alternatives to the scheme and even means that completely differ from the generally adopted one.

The scheme-injunction fails to take into account still another main consideration: the law of nonuniformity of development of production. Technical progress is not a smooth, uniformly advancing movement but one that is discontinuous. In production, as in nature, periods of quantitative accumulations are replaced by qualitative changes. It goes without saying that entire sectors of the economy, firms, plants, kolkhozes are not soldiers in a row, which on command assume a new quality; consequently, there is no universal readiness ever for the adoption of a scheme.

Of course, the scheme is a reflection of urgent necessity or main tendency, and as such, it brings up lagging elements and speeds up their progress. In regard to this quality, it has to be intelligently patient and extremely selective. But it is as a rule short on patience. The law of campaigns unflaggingly accompanies it: who is faster?! It adores introducing pace-makers, but is not particularly attentive to the results of the work. And from this weakness there stems another: it does not like to seek out persons responsible for failure and to hold them accountable--it suffers from being all-forgiving.

The scheme involves people, and its progress means collision of their interests.

An idea is thought up in someone's head. On the basis of analysis of actuality, with consideration of tendencies and prospects. The calculated, tested and validated idea is put down on paper, undergoes discussion and receives issue data: title, number, date, press--at which point it becomes a scheme. This is done by the "creators," they create a program. Subsequently, it becomes a matter for conductors, publicity people and popularizers and executors; in general all of us become executors.

The interaction of the scheme and independent endeavor begins with its very inception. In essence, what gives rise to a scheme is nothing else but the experience of the masses. Generalized, analyzed, examined through the prism of objective laws and scientific forecasts, the self-endeavor of the masses strikes the spark of an idea. Could the program of construction of accumulator-ponds have developed in Kalinin's institutions without the Maksatikhite initiative for regulation of small rivers? And was this done only in Maksatikha? I have seen with my own eyes how kolkhozes in the Upper Volga near Rzhev created small water bodies at the site of swamps, gullies and springs and used them both for irrigation and for fish breeding and for providing water to the villages. A vital need forced them to do this. The farmer needs water--he acquires it without waiting for plans from above. And only later do oblast institutions, seeing the need, thinking over the local experience, develop a scheme that takes into consideration all the needs and technical possibilities.

But it is a strange thing, the "creators" do not like to acknowledge the indebtedness of their creations to the experience of the masses; in any

case, they do not attempt to advertise this. Moreover, they are most jealous as authors and will not tolerate "any of that home-made stuff" next to their brainchild. Hence, either prohibitions, or restriction, or sometimes even mud slinging. The authors of the "Scheme of Development of Reclamation and Opening Up of Lands of Kalininskaya Oblast" had called a special conference, which stated (later turned out to be falsely): "A Selective Investigation of Three Dams Designed and Constructed by Students of KPI [Kalinin Polytechnic Institute] on Tifina River and Rivitsa River Shows That All of Them Are in a Stage of Disintegration." The conference decided that the dams could not be built without complex research or on the basis of someone else's design; they could only be on the basis of plans of Kaliningiprovd-khoz. Then the Maksatikhites requested: please helps us in the matter of research and designs, we would be grateful." To which one of the authors of the "scheme" replied: "We are not going to undertake that."

What is this, plain old ambition? Not quite. The root of such deafness is to be found in a false understanding: the scheme reflected a need, selected the best experience and went into operation--therefore there is no longer any need for self-initiative. It would seem that there is. Yes, except if you live in Kalinin rather than in a village that is suffering without water and are not accountable for a herd that has not been given water or you walk around unbathed in unwashed clothing. From the oblast center, the living everyday needs of those who live far from it simply cannot be seen; it is as if they did not exist.

Let us turn to another scheme--the "rayon planning scheme." This was compiled in the rayon, in offices close to production, where, as they say, the wind of need blows in through all windows and doors. What motivated the authors to classify hundreds of villages as "unpromising," to forbid any construction in them and to make additional inconveniences and difficulties for the residents? Did they consider the interests of the thousands of people living there in their calculations? It would seem as if they did consider. But whose interests? Promising, untellingly remote (you will live in a well-appointed settlement, which will be built in 19...), but not something that could be considered today or even tomorrow. Did they include production interests in their calculations. Oh yes, of course, they were in the very forefront. But again... of the future, theoretically ideal, but not today's, since today's are against the closing of small farms until the large ones are established and against the resettlement of people until roads have been laid and rapid and reliable communication with the fields is established and against closing down of the service sphere. What interests did the top assume? Their own. They evaluated the rayon leadership and praised it to the degree that the scheme corresponded to general directives. The directives are unified, but life is diverse. To think of how conditions in the rayon have ripened for mass settlement, whether this work should be hastened or whether small-scale resettlement has begun to hinder the growth of production does not come under the personal interest of the rayon planner.

It is necessary to uphold "one's own version," but this could lead to unpleasantness. In Zubtsovskiy Rayon, they remember a chairman of the rayispolkom who attempted to prove to the oblast leadership the soundness of local calculations and was removed from his post as one who "did not understand the requirements of the moment."

Here you have a whale in which the personal interest of the rayon planner is involved--you have to be at the oar of the moment, since this very same "to be" provides him with life and peace. I said this to an old acquaintance who for thirty years had dealings with rayon planners and heard a confession in reply:

"Yes, many things happened that are worth discussing. My sin is great as the many orders coming from the rayon I had to carry out. I planted apple trees in empty fields, I cut rye for silage, and put up arches throughout the entire rayon. Do you remember the order: put up an arch before each village, make it as beautiful and prominent as possible, and what was behind the arch... Okay, I won't rake up the past. You are right, I personally did not suffer from any of the fiascos: I lost no money, received no reprimands. The ones who suffered were those who resisted. But understand how it was: I believed. I executed consciously. This is now a back issue, we can now criticize, but then... All right, we did not succeed, it failed, we beat a retreat; then we undertake something new intelligently, we believe: it has to work out. You look, again in the wrong direction. But, the devil take it, we did advance. We stumbled, but we moved ahead! How could you not believe?"

Here you have an uncritical attitude toward "orders," adopting on faith the next scheme has for its source material independence--personal and direct--of the outcome of the work, of the results of production. My friend is right: he did not suffer, he lost no money, he received no reprimand. And, being independent, he easily fell victim to big, loudly proclaimed schemes; he lost the habit of thinking critically and acting independently, that is, he lost that very same initiative without which even a good scheme could be easily ruined.

Yes, yes, even a good scheme. The fact is that it often happens that a scheme that is excellent in itself, having its origin in the objective laws of the development of society, one that is most necessary, on coming to the one who is to carry it out, is so distorted that it becomes a hindrance to the development of the worker's initiative. Kalinin machine operator Hero of Socialist Labor Ivan Chistyakov, who is ardently for unregulated links [beznaryadnyye zven'ya], has repeatedly complained to me:

"I agitate, agitate for the unregulated, but I see no followers, and I myself have even explained: 'Don't force on machine operators the need to unite in links, but let the soil be prepared for this union.'"

Conditions must be prepared for the scheme.

In the summer of 1979, I took a trip through familiar places--the southern rayons of Pskovskaya Oblast and was gladdened by the marked vitalization of rural construction. The "multistory style" had at last been abandoned, they had begun to build houses of the farmstead type in the villages. This alone ~~initiates~~ initiative, since everyone knows that the multistory hulks cannot be built by your own efforts; they are built according to an oblast plan, by a solid contractor, under the vigilant control of the bank--you sit and wait until they come to you and erect the stories to the sky. But five-wall cottages are quite within the power of the kolkhoz, and if not the kolkhoz then the rayon. Here you manage somehow to make out, to use your brains and to show your talents.

It is truly a welcome sight to see how the new quarters are growing in the villages, but the main thing is that one is gladdened by the mood of the people; it is as if they had come out of a kind of stupor, out of somnolence; they have become more lively, energetic; they are no longer waiting for manna from heaven, they are acting on their own. But at the same time you cannot help but see that the farmstead homes are being built with a mass of inconveniences. This is how it works: the buildings are being built according to model plans--they placed the blame on uncle; we, they say, are not to blame, they gave them to us, we took them. When they let us build ourselves, it turned out that we could not do any better. We've forgotten. We are out of practice. The thought does not even arise to ask of people what kind of house they need; the desire does not arise in them to visit people, to look around or to invite competent specialists.

In a word, while the sought-for initiative has been awakened, it seems to be in no hurry to perform its natural function--to give rise to a new quality. And if this should drag out, and if the new conditions do not contribute to its development and growth, we shall very soon hear voices: look, please, nothing worthwhile is coming out of your independent activity. And then a new scheme will follow. This is how it has been with the Pskovites, whom I frequently visit and among us in Kalininskaya Oblast. Following the failure of the scheme, initiative began to come to life, but the next innovation again chased it back inside like a snail into its shell. Not just once or twice, but many times. Hence the result--we are unable to do better. But in the consciousness of the personnel of agricultural organs the impression is becoming increasingly strongly ensconced that the managerial function has been transformed from a subordinate to one dominant over production, that is, what is secondary is considered by them to be primary.

It is people who carry out a scheme. Their actions are determined by interests--personal, collective, national and their complex interaction. The ideal version toward which the scheme should aspire is coincidence, unity, a union of the interests of man, collective and society. But life is not ideal. In everyday life, some one factor prevails, hence the contradiction and collisions. In conflicting situations, which the process of

introducing an innovation contains a profusion of, it is very important to recognize what interest or interests serve as the moving force in the acts of people, their initiative or passivity.

In the course of many years of work in rural rayons, I have seen different executors. There were no thoughtless ones among them. In the sense of thoughtless, I mean that they did not see defects or, putting it a little more mildly, the inefficacy of this or that scheme. In varying degree, they did not see it all. They did not operate identically. It would be interesting to analyze in what proportion, so to say, all three interests were present in their consciousness.

Rayon official B. had an unusual character and capabilities. I observed him during the "corn epic" in our northern village. Superior knowledge, inspired determination and purposefulness, astonishing energy infected people with his confidence, and they tried very hard and conscientiously to do their job, attaining truly good harvests in a good year. We, his assistants, never even considered the thought that he did not believe in what he was teaching and what he was advocating. Once I happened to take part in a confidential conversation in which B. enunciated not just a simple doubt but the conviction (he knew the matter to perfection), that the corn campaign under our conditions was without merit. This was a prudent careerist, lending his undoubted capacities to his one and only interest--his personal position. These are extremely dangerous: if the scheme is in error, the error will be brought to the absurd.

The other type of executor--those who have voluntarily become confused--would apply to my friend, concerning whom I spoke above. He also saw the defects and failures, but because of his uncritical intelligence he believed that the new scheme took into account the experience of its predecessor and that it was undoubtedly correct. What is the dominating interest in this executor? Again personal interest, although I am convinced that in distinction to B. he does not try for the sake of his position. But neither the one or the other will try to alleviate either directly or indirectly the negative results of the scheme; they will not support initiatives "proceeding in contradiction to the directives."

But their colleague N., whom I also knew, acted differently in the same situation. Seeing how the hopes placed on the "queen" are not being justified and being unable to put a stop to the damaging experiments, he chose the roundabout way: in word--he was for the corn, in deed--he encouraged grassland farming. He spoke of his tactics as follows: "I conduct a conference, defending the 'queen,' but at the same time I let them understand that demand will be for the end product--meat and milk. Or I arrive at a farm--in front of everybody, I demand of the director adherence to the agrotechnology of corn, but when alone with him I suggest that clover should not be neglected. While I have not had 'pacemakers in introduction,' neither did I have any who were short on meat or milk."

Such "circumstances" are chosen each time when a scheme is unsound and the official assumes as paramount the common interest, and he deliberately, for the sake of things, undertakes inner dissension, subjecting himself to the danger of falling into the category of those engaging in eyewash and losing his post. This possibly is the most difficult and, I would say, dramatic alternative. It is encountered most frequently in the rayon, more rarely in the oblast. The rayon official more than the others feels the pressure from beneath, the pressure of that independent initiative which opposes the routine, seeks a way out and finds it in the position: it is for you to talk, it is for us to act. He understands that you cannot restrain this pressure, since it is backed by benefits, help for the work and produces the necessary result, and sooner or later the pressure from below will upset the scheme, will be justified and recognized, while he, the official, is left without a choice; he has to serve two "masters"--the scheme and life. Naturally, personal interest is also present here, but only of the moment; as for the future, life will assume the ascendancy, and I will found to be right--however, conviction of this outcome is not as strong as to directly and openly oppose the scheme.

I had a talk with a chairman who is a long-time friend. I ask: well, you "contrived" it; surreptitiously, you undersowed some things and oversowed others; you said everything that you should have, you made a profit; why then is it necessary to "contrive"? You could have had a meeting, it would have approved the realistic sowing plan... He replied: "That's not how it was ordered, I disobeyed, but as for admissions..."

This is what he said, but he evidently began to do a little thinking: actually, why should I quail before the bosses? I was not afraid of exercising a little "personal initiative"; I knew that it would work out all right, but I did not dare to say it aloud. And the chairman recalled that he was the authorized representative of the collective in the rayon and not an authorized official of the rayon at the kolkhoz. Since such was the case, then the appeal should be made to the collective and its opinion should be asked. How could the collective carry out an order which did not seem to be sensible to him, the director, as far as the farm was concerned. But possibly, he, the chairman, could be wrong? Possibly, he failed to think something through or to grasp it? Possibly, he was at fault in having this order, on reaching the executors, transformed into a dead scheme? And it also happens as follows: even a good scheme is not suitable for every farm. It happens that it has not reached the point of being able to use the good scheme. But it is urged: adopt it. At Kolkhoz imeni Kalinin, three cost-accounting brigades have now been working for eight years. The results are outstanding: the indicators for the kolkhoz are one and a half times higher than the average for Zubtsovskiy Rayon. They decided to disseminate the experience of the pacemakers throughout the rayon. And regardless of how many directives were issued and how much pressure was put on the other farms, cost-accounting brigades did not take in the rayon: you cannot reduce everyone to the same level, conditions at kolkhozes differ even within the bounds of a single rayon.

Under such unintelligent pressure, chairmen begin to shift and dodge and to "contrive."

Let us take a fresh example--in many places, specialization in field cropping (there where it has been introduced intelligently, combined with the initiative of the masses!) has found favor. In a number of our rayons, it has impinged primarily on two most labor-intensive crops--flax and potatoes. One farm is ordered to plant only flax, another only potatoes. Here and there they have used a transitional version: they added potatoes, reduced flax, or vice versa. In any case the existing system of land use has been ruined; the real possibilities have either been taken into consideration approximately or not taken into account at all--the expected result failed to be accomplished: expenses were not reduced, labor productivity was not boosted, gross yields did not increase. The chairmen and the directors proceed on their own in the fields, but in the reports they put down what is expected of them.

These cases are considered officially as eyewash, but in actuality they are nothing else but the forced use of initiative. The farm head adopts a hidden maneuver, because it is demanded by the good of the collective, which, as a rule, works for the benefit of society. Doing something secretly on one's own is possibly one of the most widespread forms into which is poured the full internal drama of the struggle of reality with a poor scheme. Were there no resistance, a faulty scheme would disclose its unsoundness and, for the general good, its time would at that point come to an end. Hidden resistance extends this time: it would appear as if something had to come out of the adopted measures. But the fact is that nothing can come of it since the collective interest and the protection of one's own affairs give rise to a circumventive maneuver. And the struggle drags out, sometimes for a rather extended time.

Let us take that same scheme of rayon planning. Despite prohibitions, here and there they have put up residential dwellings and cow barns in the unpromising villages, while writing into the reports "on resettlement" some escheated cottages. In reading these papers in the oblast, they believed that some progress was willy-nilly going on, and it should be continued in the same spirit. All the more so, since the actual process of concentration of the population is objective, the economy itself puts a cross on superfluous small households, since it is not the idea of resettlement that is bad but the method of putting this idea into practice.

In the final analysis, the interests of the collective and society win out, but in this struggle of life and scheme, it must be admitted that the collective interest time and again fades, loses its primary importance in the consciousness of people, yielding its place to personal interests, their interconnection is weakened and man begins to reorient himself toward another collective, one that is more stable and reliable. In other words, the kolkhoz farmer, seeing a decline in the collective farm on whose

condition his well-being depends, leaves for another place--a plant or an institution--whose collective would guarantee the protection of his own interest.

Investigators of village problems have long noted this reason, but in my opinion they do not attach to it the decisive significance when they try to explain the mass exodus of people from the village. We shall examine it subsequently, but let us now return to the problem of indomitability of the scheme. What gives it such persistence, conceit and confidence in its infallibility? Why is it so inattentive to its primogenitor--popular initiative?

Let us say that schemes of everyday and production services for the village have been worked out and are being actively introduced. They are extensive and detailed. In conformity with them, a network of service institutions is being reorganized and remodeled. Repair shops, stores, workshops, hospitals, libraries and offices are being concentrated in the rayon centers; large villages (sela) are left with centers (punkty), stations (tochki) and branches, while small villages (derevni) have recourse only to trips and visits. Conveniences have been added for the resident of a rayon center, but they have been reduced for the village resident. Whose interests are in conflict in this reshuffle and in what manner? The everyday-services combine is a collective, and the village is a collective. Which depends on what? Normally, the first on the second, the one who is providing services on the one who makes use of them. In reality, such is not the case. The combine obtains planned profits from the city dweller, while the villager, when he has the need, will bring the money himself.

The material interest of offenders against this way of life does not oblige or obliges to a lesser degree to look for a profit. This has always been so: if a tailor, let us say, is satisfied with his earnings at home, he stays there, goes nowhere, does not look for a customer; if he is not satisfied, then he goes out looking. The interest of the village collective is such as to have the "services" come to it, since breaking away from work, from production in which all its material interests lie is not advantageous to it. What wins out? The combine, of course, since it does not depend either directly or indirectly (through the material condition of the villager) on basic production; it does not show a desire to obtain the highest profits and therefore opens branches; it carries out visits only because of instructions and not because of motivation.

This independence is even more clearly delineated in the sphere of production services. A whole network of services exists for the tractor park, animal-husbandry farms, filling stations, power installations and fields of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. For example, a brigade of adjusters arrives at an animal-husbandry farm; it checks as a preventive measure milking machines and receives a certain sum. In two days, the equipment goes out of order: the cows are unmilked, the kolkhoz (and the milkmaids) are at a loss. And the adjusters? The adjusters are the gainers; they will come again and

collect more money. The interests of the two collectives--of the kolkhoz farmers and the adjusters--in this case are in direct opposition. For the former, it is advantageous for the milking machines to work perfectly, for the latter--just the opposite, for them to go out of order as often as possible. One cannot seriously think of the efficiency of the scheme in the case of impunity of some and the lack of rights of the other companions; its faults are seen, as they say, with the naked eye.

Or, for example, a planning institutes is interested in developing and pushing through its brain child--a cattle yard. The kolkhoz needs a cheap, convenient and efficiently operating animal-husbandry farm. There would be no conflict if the kolkhoz acts as a client and the institute as a contractor guaranteeing with material accountability the high quality of the plant. But inasmuch as the planners are not materially accountable for errors they might make, the institute flourishes in any outcome, while the kolkhoz suffers losses and society loses out on the whole. It is clear that in the conflict of interests of two or many collectives some interests are hurt and as a result society suffers--such is the nature of socialist production.

In this abnormal situation, where the sphere of management and the sphere of services are not dependent on the effectiveness of production and in addition stand over it with the right to order and to forbid, is to be found the cause of the tenacity of unsound, impractical schemes. If you do not intend to collect fruit from the orchard, you may as well plant apple trees upside down.

Interest is displayed through the behavior and actions of people. The head of the collective is the expresser of its interest, in our case--the kolkhoz chairman. In order for the interest to be caught and expressed, a soundly operating mechanism of public opinion is needed. Such a mechanism has been provided and created; it consists of brigade and general kolkhoz meetings, village assemblies, brigade councils, the managing board, the auditing commission and public organizations. Comments, proposals, protests, petitions, complaints--everything that is expressed in one way or another is summed up in the chairman's head, analyzed, thought over, causing him to act. But the actions of the chairman depend not only on how correctly he understands the collective interest but also on how accountable he is in his actions to the collective.

Vasily Nikolayevich Rybin, chairman of a kolkhoz in Pril'men'ye, at the height of the campaign for specialization of animal husbandry, in accordance with which he was to hold only large-horned cattle, decided to leave on the farm half a thousand sheep and thirty sows. In the rayon, quite understandably, they expressed their dissatisfaction and criticized Rybin, accusing him of "willfulness and lack of understanding"; colleague-chairmen said sarcastically that, so to say, one burden was not enough for the man, he had to carry three...

Circumstances should have moved Rybin in the direction of submission to the scheme, as they did many others. But at the kolkhoz meeting, the opinion was definitely expressed: hold on to the sheep and pigs! The small pig farm provided the subsidiary farms without about 600 piglets; each family had meat and surpluses were sold at the bazaar or through the procurement office. Lamb went to public dining. The animal-husbandry farms were fed from the wastes of field cultivation (flax bolls and the like), which go to waste on specialized farms. Three years later, when the defects of the scheme had been disclosed and its authors had shifted in favor of small farms and encouragement of subsidiary farms, they began to cite Rybin as an example of a far-seeing leader. The collective interest lay along the same track as the national interest, but for some reason or other it was the chairman rather than the creators of the scheme who saw this.

Another case. Nikolay Mikhaylovich Nazarov and Mikhail Yefimovich Golubev, chairman of kolkhozes on the Upper Volga, adopted the following measure fifteen years ago at the time of various limitations being imposed on subsidiary farms: they allocated public clover for private livestock; they cut it with mowing machines, dried it and brought it on trucks to the households. The haying campaign was reduced from two months to three days. The people did not wear themselves out from the inconvenience of cutting it at odd moments; they did not get nervous, but calmly, worked without distraction in the public sector. They did not sell off the cows, milk surpluses went into the rayon plan, while the kolkhoz contracted for the calves, fattened them and sold them for meat at a profit. Here again you have the general good, but to defend it you need a firm character and a sense of responsibility to the collective.

These are examples of defense of the concrete material interest, they can be more obviously understood. It is more difficult to speak of the preservation of the collective as a full-blooded viable organism. If, let us say, the proportions of the various age groups are allowed to be disrupted, when many oldsters and many young people, many boys and not enough girls are found to occur (which we often observe in the northern village) and so on, the collective cannot function normally, that is, it cannot provide most fully for the interests of its members and serve the national interest.

In the periodical press, much is written about the experience of chairmen in dealing with "satisfaction of the needs of young people," with "saturation of spiritual life," but not one of these publications examines the difficult questions from the standpoint of protection of the interests of the collective. Also the sciences--sociology and psychology provide little on this level for practical guidance. And if we analyze the actions of such chairmen like Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Petrov, who has now headed for fifty years Moldino kolkhoz, we see that their entire activity is subordinated to concern for the sound being of the collective. On the other hand, the negative effect of technological schemes on the nonmaterial interests of the collective would seem to be most clearly seen in the case of leading farms. Schemes that belittle or forbid individual initiative affect the soul most painfully.

The proponents of a poor scheme liberally pin labels of "immature person," "saboteur," "defender of unhealthy tendencies" and the like first of all to chairmen, as their position is most frequently the most serious hindrance in the way of its "adoption." It is most revealing how Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Petrov acts in such conflicting situations. He was once forced to plow up clover. He called a general meeting of kolkhoz members and brought up for discussion the question: "to plow up or not to plow up." The meeting voted in favor of the clover. Not a single one of those who insisted on the opposite dared to proceed against the lawful decision of the collective. It is no accident that the necessity for strict observance of kolkhoz democracy has been emphasized in many party decisions, that is, that same mechanism for the disclosing and expression of collective interests, the sound operation of which is a guarantee against hare-brained schemes.

"...A more fearsome enemy exists for the land than plow or weed—it is the foisting on its of all kinds of "recommendations." There have been too many of them and they have cost the country too much not to understand that commands to agriculture are by their very nature contraindicated," L.I. Brezhnev very justly pointed out in his work "Virgin Land."

I remember that a special emphasis was made in the 1960s on the choosing of brigade councils, regular convocations of brigade meetings and rural assemblies. This was due to the fact that kolkhozes were being consolidated while individual farms and collectives were just beginning to fold up. Today, in the beginning of the 1980s, the situation is different. Field-cultivating brigades do not exist or practically do not exist; they have been replaced by tractor detachments, independent farm complexes; the shop structure is becoming increasingly prevalent. In terms of its labor share on the general farm, the primary collective (brigade) has become more important. On the other hand, the collective as a whole (the kolkhoz) has lost a part of its production functions and together with them the possibility of directly defending its own interests. Specialization has resulted in the fact that in the creation of the end product of the soil—grain, meat, milk—land-improvement specialists, repairmen, agrochemists, construction workers, adjusters and so on the same level as kolkhoz members. Several collectives have come into being, which would appear to be in equal measure interested in the fertility of the earth and in the economic strength of the farm. But the pity is that the interest of servicing collectives does not wholly coincide with the interest of the manager and at times is directly in opposition to it as we have seen in the case of the adjusters of the milking equipment. It is clear that for the coordination of the operations of all links of the one chain there is need some one public organ of the meeting or council of representatives type.

Such an organ has been provided and created—it consists of councils of founders of interfarm associations. Have they proved themselves in fact? Take the interkolkhoz construction association. Kolkhozes set it up, made payments to it, chose an administration and put over it a council of representatives.

Kayon interfarm construction associations were united into an oblast association and oblast associations into republic associations. And they were over their founders. Volume of construction-installation work, the list of projects, profits and other indicators come from above; they deal with interkolkhoz construction columns as they please, but not so the founders. The same applies to the interkolkhoz forestry organization, the interkolkhoz road association, the interfarm breeding association, the cattle fattening organization and so on and so forth. It turns out that the children on standing on their own feet do not wish to acknowledge their own parents.

I think that here is something for the personnel of the Ministry of Agriculture to cut off their heads over--it is essential to urgently implement some kind of measures.

It's fantastic! At the height of carrying out the very broad program of renewing the nonchernozem region, the papers suddenly contained alarming articles on the passivity of the farmer: the youth as before are leaving the countryside; lack of participation on the part of the rural inhabitant is growing; the attitude toward the land and toward grain is marked in some places by indifference... It was as if he, the farmer, had not seen or heard that the time had arrived for big changes on his land. The authors of the articles are perplexed: what has happened to the native Russian peasant?

In fact--what? And the main thing--when? Two-three years ago, they did not write about this.

Any phenomenon involves a process. Years and years may pass from the time of the first, not immediately detected symptoms of the occurring process to their full manifestation, especially in social phenomena. But the eternal attitude of the peasant toward the land expressed in the proverb "you may get ready to die, but first sow the field," cannot be transformed in one hour into complete indifference: if it is not sown, no problem, I'll move closer to the bakery. Or, let us say, a village is without eligible young women. Oh, how much we talk about this. Did these girls get together, reach an agreement and leave all at once? No, the process took years. Both this and other things concerning which they are now writing with alarm and anguish we did not particularly grasp and were in no hurry to give them publicity. But it would be worthwhile to think as to why these things were not studied, were not publicized.

The Russian Nonchernozem Region remained for a long time in oblivion. The attention of the press, and consequently of society, was directed to other regions: Siberian virgin lands, Volga steppes, Kuban chernozem lands where big things on the state scale were in progress. There was simply no mention of the Nonchernozem Region. Even if publicists from among "rural-nonchernozem stock" even attempted to interest editors to some degree in urgent problems relating to it, the editors would reply to them: "Really, what kind of

problems could you have there, you do not even live by your own bread." But the land--which is such land!--could not live without attention. Something was happening on the land. But what? What?..

Now they have started to speak of the "virgin-land character," there in the virgin lands, in the difficult struggle for the grain, there were formed a special stubbornness, conditioning, inflexibility, elan, talent in the character of the farmer. What is surprising in that? A big job makes the man big. This is the truth. We speak in different degrees of "Siberian character," "northern character," "Russian character." Land and man are indivisible. The land forms the character, the character changes the land.

The publicists are more frequently among us in Kalininskaya Oblast and, remembering the verity "land and man are interrelated," they have made a conclusion concerning the "regional character" of our muzhik. They say the strips of fields, the ten-household villages, the lakes and little rivers with their drowsy water, the small intervening forests--are all of such a small scale, not moving, standing for centuries, that the inhabitant of these places could only be a passive observer, a nonwinged adherent of an ancient order.

A small grain of truth is to be found in such assertions, but a very small one. It turns out, following the logic of these publicists, something like this: our land possesses a magic property, it makes our character, but is not subject to reciprocating action; it does not submit to transformation. Of course, this is naive. The schoolboy knows that the Pskov, Tver, Novgorod, Kostroma muzhik had the character to conquer austere land and to engage in fierce battles. From him were derived the "Siberian," and the "virgin-land," and sundry characters.

Our land has lacked the attention of the writing fraternity. The problems appearing in newspaper articles were stated superficially, without incision. The character of the peasant was shown not in dealing with the difficulties of our austere land that was not submissive to human concern but rather in poster fashion: a tractor operator (space for name) has plowed so many hectares, a combine operator (space for name) has threshed so many tons of grain... I recall the following very typical conversation with an editor:

"This is not written badly, you get the feeling of a knowledge of the countryside. But why are individual cases, separate facts taken for developments?"

"A fact does not arise out of nothing, it is the manifestation of a tendency."

"You are drawn to global generalization. But a generalization leads to denial."

"Of course. To a denial of the obsolete, the outmoded."

"I am not against facts, but..."

How he, timid person that he is, is afraid of developments! And--acridity. He says plainly: "That is too acrid. You will have to make it milder." As if we are not dealing with current affairs but with some sort of sauce for a meat dish.

And yet at the November (1978) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, L.I. Brezhnev emphasized in an address, recalling the role and tasks of our information service: "We have a strong, qualified propaganda apparatus. But, unfortunately, this apparatus is not always used effectively. There is felt a lack of principled, major articles dealing with the urgent problems of economic and social life. Frequently, newspaper materials and transmissions on television and radio lack conviction and serious generalizations; they are overburdened with general phrases, offering nothing for the mind or the heart."

But should not the editorial offices of local newspapers be the first to note an ugly manifestation of our days--of so-called "takers" [nesuny--literally carriers]. They take from field and farm, from plant and from construction project anything they can get hold of: potatoes, milk cans, a ball of yarn, a plank, a can of paint... Whether they need it or not, they still take it. On the sly and openly. But the newspapers give the appearance that nothing is taking place.

This is what has happened to the character of the farmer: as long as it grew--they saw nothing, but when it broke--they became suddenly aware.

Well, all right, they overlooked things, why torment oneself, but what has happened must be understood. The sooner, the better. And if possible without any mistakes.

There have been many talks on this topic. Each in his own way tries to understand and to explain, but in general all the arguments can be reduced to two opinions: where should the pressure be applied--on consciousness or on material interest? I happened to witness an argument between the aged Boris Ivanovich, serving as one of the "supervisory rayon planners" and young Yuriy Vladimirovich, a scientist-chemist.

"Among the young everything boils down to the ruble," the former was proving. "When did they manage to become such 'materialists'? If something is lying, they do not pick it up; if you do not tell them, they won't do it, and if they do pick it up, it is not for nothing--pay me. In school they teach, in the institute they teach--where does it all go? You must finally understand, everything that is done is for you, everything is yours. Elementary decency obliges one to be a manager."

"You, Boris Ivanovich, forgive me, are an idealist," the latter parried. "In your opinion, everything is in the consciousness, according to us, it

is in the interest. In material interest, of course. Primarily, but not only. Give me good pay, I will do my work, I will do it well, but without soul. Without inspiration, if you wish."

"It turns out that what inspires us is the idea, you--the ruble."

"No, what are you saying. Still a ruble is a ruble. Material interest is the basis. It is the basis for the man who works by the clock and for me, a scientific worker. It obliges the former to go through the motions--and only that, while it provides me with the opportunity of doing creative work. Qualitatively different labor, I hope you understand. The ruble must not be "blind.""

The scientist, it would appear, was close to the truth when he spoke of the desire to create. Actually, were not the labor and the entire life of Boris Ivanovich and his generation creative work? They were, and how: they remade the country! Everything from scratch, without the benefit of examples and analogies from history. This was the highest ascent of all the creative capacities of the people! And each one in his work, big or little, prominent or obscure, was a creator. But here is what is surprising: they refashioned, created--and we refuse our own children the right to improve what was done for them. But it does not happen that way, Boris Ivanovich. It simply does not happen! Each generation changes the world, its life, its work. This is as natural as breathing air. But according to you, all that is necessary is to understand and value what has been done by our dads and granddads and to be eternally gratefully. Yuriy Vladimirovich is right that this is the purest of idealism, a rose-hued dreaming of a "probing consciousness." No, consciousness is not the product of verbal manipulations; it is an unceasing struggle, and it is forged only in such struggle rather than in a warm bed with everything ready.

No matter how large the capital investments in our land have been, they were so made and resulted in significant changes in productive forces. While lagging somewhat, the region developed together with the country, and machine labor replaced manual labor--in the field a little earlier, on the animal-husbandry farm a little later. Of course, speaking of all-round mechanization as an accomplished fact would be unforgiveable empty rhetoric; a great deal of resources and time are still required for it, but to disparage it and especially not to note the qualitatively new character of agricultural labor would be no less an error, since the character of a man is to be found in the character of his labor.

Let us take some concrete examples. Let us say a milkmaid. There is hardly a person to be found who needs to be told that the milk yield of a cow wholly depends on the milkmaid. Take a careless, clumsy worker and even the most productive cow will not provide much milk, while with an experienced and concerned worker, an ordinary brown cow could turn out to be a record maker. That is how it was formerly when a milkmaid took care of ten-twelve cows. She milked them, fed them, gave them water, led them to

the bull, fed the calf, cleaned the barn, that is, she did everything. She developed this all-roundness and worked it up into an art in which there were no trifles and everything was necessary and important, and where you had to have measure and commonsense in everything. Mechanization of animal-husbandry farms not only increased the "load" to fifty cows, and on some farms to one hundred, but also broke down the labor process into operations, leaving only one to the milkmaid--milking. Furthermore, at complexes with shop technology of cattle maintenance, the milkmaid no longer had the same cows; there is a shop of best milkers (tsakh razdoya), a commercial milk shop. The art of the all-round master is at an end, the milkmaid no longer has a need for it. From now on, all the fine points have to be known by the livestock specialist, so that each worker knows to perfection his operation and performs it conscientiously. Conveyor! Like any plant conveyor. And the time has come to think how not to ruin, not to put an end in the soul of man all those promptings and prods, which caused him to attain the heights of mastery and which awakened and maintained the unceasing creative search.

But the scheme is deaf and blind. Look at it: building reinforced concrete giant structures for 400, 800, 1,000 cows, introducing a shop content, an insemination station--one for the entire oblast, calf sorting; for breeding--at farm A--30 kilometers away, for meat--at farm B--50 kilometers away, and so on and so forth. And not one line about man! Technologists play their own line: psychology is not our function. Then whose? Psychologists, NOTists? Such services are not to be found in the countryside, and it would appear, and they are not foreseen in the next ten years. But in man an attitude is being formed in regard to his new duties. Spontaneously. Varying from place to place. Where there is order on a farm--they have gropingly found something, where there is no order--confusion follows: "take away your devil; why should I need it more than anything else?.."

The same thing in the field. True, the tractor operator is by nature more of a collectivist than a milkmaid; he has been from the very beginning in a brigade, and the feeling of his dependence on the collective is stronger. But here you have another difficulty. Whereas the milkmaid even now receives pay for the liters she has milked, the tractor operator--for the hectares he has worked rather than for the grain, and he does not particularly take care of his comrade. As for initiative, the tractor operator in the field does not have the "freedom of technological maneuver." The agronomist and the engineer work out the conveyor in which the tractor operator is given a role to perform--and only that. He cannot sow in a particular field oats, or barley, or even to detach the mower, and to attach a rake so as to take in the hay before a rain is not his to do. And how much to sow or plant is not his to decide.

Here is what schemes sometimes do not take into account--the new character of labor and the new position of the farmer in the collective labor process. Many schemes in this regard are conservative. Their authors do not seem to take into account the average featureless worker on the register. Let

us say that they have compiled a scheme of specialization of plantgrowing at the rayon agricultural administration. This is when they should have consulted with the machine operators! They are the ones who have to sow and harvest. And who better than they, who have plowed their entire life the same fields, would know what they are best suited for. Who better than they could say with certainty whether the kolkhoz would be able to cultivate 700 hectares of flax or would not be able to do so? But the rayon specialists have not thought of turning to them for advice; they sat down at their tables, ran their fingers over the keys of calculating machines, divided the engines by the number of operators, multiplied quintals by hectares--it is all done, here is your plan, put it in your pipe and smoke it! I am exaggerating, of course, you understand, but the meaning is--office calculations.

How do you explain the lack of desire to consult with the farmer? There is no way of doing it. Still it is possible. Let us imagine ourselves in the place, say, of the chief of the rayon agricultural administration. A directive has come from the oblast--begin work on developing a specialization plan. Where do you begin?

Reasoning theoretically, you should call together representatives, analyze the situation in field-crop cultivation and convincingly prove the advantageousness and need of concentration of crops. Then go to the kolkhoz and at a general meeting bring up the new plan for approval. A kolkhoz cannot be ordered, it can only be recommended, since the master of the kolkhoz is the general meeting. Whether the meeting adopts the plan or does not adopt it depends on the validity of the arguments and a sober accounting of the resources and possibilities of the farm.

That is how it should be. But that is not how it always is. The administration chief puts some specialists to work; they collect masses of figures, analyze, apportion, compile and, although at times they may see that some planned figure is unrealistic, they still include it in the proper column, as otherwise the plan "won't work," it would lack refinement. The specialists will work on a "beautiful plan on paper, being concerned least of all how it will come out in practice, what the result will be, although they would never say this openly. And all because there is no feedback control--the plowman cannot depend of his supervisor compensation for the losses foisted on him by the scheme. In my opinion, here, precisely here, is to be found the primal cause of many faults--in the infringement on man's natural and lawful right as a member of a collective farm to be the master of the land secured for him for eternal use. This has been mentioned not once or twice, but many times in high party decisions. The new economic conditions demand the strict observance of this right. Mechanization of production has placed the farmer in the position of a worker on a conveyor and narrowed down the field of his initiative. And if you were in addition to take away from him, the farmer, a decisive voice in general operational affairs, then what will remain of the most creative vocation in the whole wide world?

Mechanization inevitably brings with it specialization. Specialized organizations have "taken away" from the tractor operator his vital farming operations peculiar to him since ancient times: fertilizing of the soil, liming, drainage and so forth, that is, the "roots," and left him with the "tops": plowing, sowing, reaping, but they are not accountable for what grows up, and the tractor operator cannot hold them accountable. Moreover, some production schemes seemingly undermine on purpose their lack of confidence in the plowman. Liming of the soil, draining, application of peat are paid for to the contractor, bypassing the proprietor, directly from Gosbank. And at a general meeting or session of the management board, the farmer may not demand that the work of a bad workman, for example, not be paid. And he can say what business is it of mine, after all the money is not ours. In such blunders, of course, one can blame the agronomist, the chairman, or whomever you please, and there will be reason for that, but it won't change the state of affairs. The thing is that the future development of productive forces, creating a need for specialization, creates other conditions for the manifestation of the public activity of the farmer—the field of his interest has come to exceed the bounds of the kolkhoz and now takes in the entire rayon.

Sharp changes have occurred in another field, in the purely living, life-style area. The kolkhoz household is disappearing. The city dweller, possibly may not know that the kolkhoz household and the family are not one and the same thing. The kolkhoz household is a special family-production unit: actually the family of the kolkhoz member, the house, the yard structures, the livestock and a plot of land.

Let us see what has happened to the "household" of Aleksandr Shavrov, a tractor operator from the village of Kokoshkino near Rzhnev. His family consisted of six people: he and his wife, his mother—an ancient kolkhoz worker—and three sons. Today, only he and the wife remain. The mother has been buried and the sons, having been trained to be machine operators, are now married and living apart. The kolkhoz gave all three communal apartments in the new settlement beyond the birch grove, three hundred meters distant from the father's house. Instead of a single kolkhoz household, there are now four. But that is not quite right; the father's household remains as before a household, while those of the sons are only families. They have neither a vegetable garden, nor livestock, nor cow barns; they are just family people renting an apartment and living on their wages.

Aleksandr Shavrov's kolkhoz household is connected by numerous threads of economic interest to the collective farm. He needs grazing land for the cattle, a hayfield, firewood, straw for bedding for the animals, transport for working his private plot, a horse or tractor for the vegetable garden, planking, stakes, logs for repairing the house and the pens, and so on and so forth. He is therefore personally interested in seeing that the hayfields are clean, the pasturage is not too far away, and not just ordinary pasture land, but one with a good grass stand, that the woodland does not get too thin or become littered with trash and that the field is rich in its

yield--in a word, it is to his benefit for the land to be productive. And the sons? As for the sons, it is all the same: they in no way suffer there is no place to pasture the livestock, or if the wood burns down or is completely pulled out by the roots, and there is no reason to mow the meadow!.. All their gain and all their welfare have their origin in a pair of able hands. What are they going to bother about, stand up for, defend at a kolkhoz meeting. For there to be enough spare parts for the machinery, for orders to be written out correctly and on time, for there to be order in the garage. Quite possibly, just that. Should there be something left in the field of the flax trust, should straw not be procured, should the meadow not be mowed, should a shepherd not be found and one has to take turns at being a shepherd--all this does not personally apply to them, they do not have to worry. A visible, perceptible tie with the public farm and with all the surrounding land no longer exists for them. They are just workers like at any city enterprise.

Such kolkhoz farmers are increasing in number. They may now possibly constitute a majority. In Kokoshkino there are only ten kolkhoz households, while the settlement now has sixty such families like those of Shavrov's sons. The present turn in the direction of individual houses of the farmstead type will not stop the process of curtailing the number of kolkhoz households, since together with this the construction of "multistories" will continue; but the main thing is the fact that the young peasant no longer has much of a desire to live as a "household." The social development of the countryside is relentless proceeding in the "urban" direction.

Such are some of the changes in village life caused by the economy. Let us add to them another, which has come about through the natural course of time. The replacement of generations has come to an end. The last frontier people, soldiers' widows, farmers of the war and postwar period are going on pension.

I still see before my eyes the small farm dining room. The tables have been arranged in a row. On one side you have the young army-trained boys on the other--their gray-haired, thick-set fathers with the palms of their hands dark from rubbing against metal. Such was the meeting of veteran tractor operators and their replacement. One of the old men said: "There are few of us,"--and the heads moved as though by a wind, their weather-beaten faces turned sad, and a deep sigh could be heard: "Ah, brothers, how many of us succumbed on fields that were not theirs!.." In that small room, many said at the time that the veterans should not coop themselves up in their cottages, but should organize some kind of council and find something to do for experienced hands.

Words that are very true! For today going on pension in the countryside means going out of production. Formerly the old man worked as long as they had the strength to do so; but now, first, there is no need; second, work within one's strength (sowing of flax or potatoes, the animal-husbandry farm, fertilizer) is now far away, not just behind the fence of one's village, but five-six versts away; third, they have started to work with engines, which not every old man knows how to handle. And if you do not work,

you will not always be called to the meeting; they do not select you to the various commissions there and they have no need of your experience, knowledge or skills--life passes you by. It is true--a gladdening occurrence!--today tutorship [nastavnichestvo] has become widespread, and this is a very important and a very necessary link in the system of transmission of the experience of the old generation to the new generation.

And one thing more. Mechanization has brought with it concentration of production, the latter in its turn--concentration of the population. The working generation, the children and grandchildren of the veterans have been moving and continue to move to central villages and settlements, while the old men, who are rooted to their native localities, are not always ready to follow the young and remain in small villages. The transmission of ideas, skills, traditions--all that very rich heritage, which is called the moral experience of a generation, cannot successfully be carried out if one does not labor and live shoulder to shoulder together on an everyday basis. This means that in performing the necessary work relating to the preparation of moving peasants from unpromising villages to the well-appointed larger ones, we must not forget the kolkhoz member who is a pensioner--it is necessary to convince him that he is needed in the new village and that, in planning it, it is necessary that the likes and needs of the old man also be taken into account--that he not be driven to the fifth floor, not deprived of his private plot, yard for livestock and so on and so forth.

In this connection, the question arises: does the production scheme take into account the psychological consequences of the economic measures? Let us consider from this point of view a scheme for new construction of a village. From considerations of economy of materials, land and labor, the authors of the scheme took the course of multistory construction. Did this result in economy? Seemingly yes--outlays of pipe, cable, bricks and other materials were reduced. But thousands of peasant families, on moving to these stories, were deprived of their private plot and a perceptible curtailment took place in the production of meat, milk, potatoes and vegetables. The small economy has turned out to be a big loss. It would seem that correction of this does not call for labor. The foisted limitations have been removed; moreover, we support in every possible way the subsidiary farm (we build pens, provide hay, grainforage, transport), but the peasant is in no hurry to get some livestock. Why? Because there has already been formed a certain psychological type of villager, who lives in a communal apartment with everything available, and whether you provide him or not with a livestock pen, he is not going to get and keep a cow: he has lost the skills, he does not want to burden himself with added concerns. The new psychology, as we see, has become an economic category and the result has become the cause. Now only economic sanctions (encouragement of the subsidiary farm) will not be enough to rectify the matter; you need means of acting on the psychology.

Or another example. For many years they struggled to introduce the link organization of labor in the fields in Kalininskaya Oblast (and others as

well). The results could already be seen: the crops came up, there was also a growth of a concerned attitude toward the land, to the machinery--a certain type of machine operator was developing with the developed feeling of a manager. Then the specialist found that this method for some technological reasons was unsuitable and developed the so-called the detachment-echelon [otryadno-echelonnyy] method of cultivating the land, as a result of which, the field becomes "nobody's": the tractor operators plow it, sow and harvest en masse, no one is responsible for anything. The feeling of proprietor of field and grain that had been created began to begin to decline; it is being forced out by the psychology of the hired contractor.

I recall along this line a conversation with Anatoliy Il'yushenkov, a machine operator of the Pekovskiy Prozhektor Kolkhos. Here is what he said of the feeling of being a proprietor of the field:

"The chairman once ordered to wake us up at three o'clock in the morning. The brigade leaders walked through the villages, knocking on windows: get up, you have to spread the fertilizer, you have to harrow... We get up, get the tractors started... But where are the harrows? Where is the loader? As we look for the harrows, as we wait for the loader, we look--it is already ten o'clock. They badgered us and badgered us, and we lagged behind. I don't need a command as to when to get up; just say: here is your land, grow so and so on it, and I'll determine myself when, what and how it should be done. And as to what I can't make out, I'll call the agronomist..."

A scheme is viable only when it provides an opportunity for developing the creative initiative of the masses, when it, in outlining the end goal, does not shackle the initiative of the grower but, on the contrary, encourages it.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev spoke on this point quite accurately in a speech at a pre-election meeting of the voters of Bauman'skiy Electoral District of Moscow on 22 February of this year:

"...There, where they sit with folded hands awaiting for instructions from above on any questions--there you will not find success. But, if on the other hand, people boldly undertake work, provide freedom of initiative and take up worthwhile initiatives--success is assured."

COPYRIGHT: "Nash sovremennik". 1980

7697

CSO: 1800

'REACTIONARY' NATURE OF JUDAISM ATTACKED

Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 18 Jul 80 pp 2-3

[Article by N. Gol'denberg, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences:
"Religion in the Modern World: With the Talmud against Progress"]

[Text] Each time a scientific work appears in the Soviet Union which examines Judaism along with other religions, Zionist propaganda and Judaic clergymen raise an improbable hullabaloo. Ill-intentioned accusations of antisemitism immediately are advanced against the Marxist-atheists inasmuch as the Judaic religion surpasses all others and so a special approach is needed to it. Just wherein lies its "exceptional nature"? According to J. Rothenshteyn, an apologist of Judaism, in a book published in London: in the fact that Judaism not only is a religious teaching, but it allegedly also includes Jewish culture, history, language and ethnic substance.

But this interpretation of the problem is far from the truth.

From a scientific standpoint Judaism is a religion disseminated chiefly among the Jews, and nothing more. But terminological anarchy, an arbitrary mixing and shifting of concepts, and an arbitrary expansion of their semantic make-up is a well-known technique of juggling and a unique sign of any antiscientific concept. A groundless conclusion stems from such reasoning that criticism of any other religion concerns only that religion alone, but the very same criticism with Judaism as its object "insults the people, who are indivisible from it." Left out of the reckoning here is that fundamentally important circumstance that scientific atheism refutes the illegal identification of Jews both with Judaism and with Zionism, since a majority of Jews are neither Judaists nor Zionists.

The imaginary uniqueness and "supreme service" of Judaism is inferred by its protectors above all from the fact that allegedly monotheism took shape in its midst primordially and for the first time in history, and subsequently it had a substantial effect on the development of Christianity

and Islam. Scientific criticism long ago persuasively debunked attempts to ascribe some kind of exceptional merit to Judaic monotheism by proving that, first of all, monotheistic trends clearly can be traced both in ancient Egypt and among peoples who settled the area between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, and so on, and secondly, that pure monotheism never existed anywhere.

It also is not present in Judaism. This very ancient religion, the sources of which can be traced back to before 1000 BC, initially absorbed primitive religious beliefs of the Semitic tribes who roamed the Arabian desert and worshiped the moon, animals, plants and "vaals" (idols)--patrons of the fields and forests. Only after the establishment of a slaveholding state was a chief god--Yahweh [Jehovah]--singled out from the multitude of tribal gods. But even in contemporary Judaism worshiping of "forefathers" has been preserved along with the Yahweh cult and Talmud literature also infers an innumerable assemblage of angels and demons.

The similarity of Judaism to all other religions has been scientifically established and proven. It consists of a fantastic, distorted interpretation of natural and social phenomena in people's minds. And this similarity reduces to naught all attempts to discover in Judaism any fundamental advantages and knocks from the Zionists' hands one of the weapons for keeping up national self-conceit.

All other components of Judaism are organically linked with the predominant dogma on a single god Yahweh (we will recall that it was the idea of God that F. Engels termed the "essence of religion"), and particularly the groundless concept of the supernatural origin of His "sacred" book. They are called the Tanach (Old Testament) and special significance is attached to its first five books which together make up the Torah (The Law) and the Talmud--a multivolume codex of commentary on the Tanach and chiefly on the Torah.

Much already has been done by the freethinkers of past centuries to refute the precepts of the "god-given nature of the Judaic religion," such as by KhiviGabaiki, an Iranian Jew who lived in the 9th century and who expressed the conviction that "the Law of Moses" was called into being by earthly reasons. Prominent philosopher-materialist B. Spinoza and others made a significant contribution to criticism of the theological fabrications about the heavenly sources of the Judaic dogmatic complex.

Judaic theologians set aside a special place for the dogma which prominent American Rabbi A. Herzberg worded as follows: "The essence of Judaism lies in affirmation of the god-chosen nature of the Jewish people, and all the rest consists of commentary." Taken up by Zionism and included in the context of its contemporary doctrine and of Judaic clerical preaching, this dogma acquired a clearly nationalistic and racist sound.

Not one Judaic theologian will venture to disavow the dogma of "chosen by God"--without this there is no Judaism. But it is difficult to expound it in the initial Biblical wording, since today sympathy hardly will be evoked not only among non-Jews, but even among honest Jewish believers by such words, for example: "Happy art thou, O Israel! Who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord . . . Thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places (i.e., necks--Author)." (Deuteronomy, 33;29.) For this reason foreign ideologues of Judaism are trying to propose a renovated "improved" interpretation of "chosen of God." The basic direction of the modernization consists of depicting the "chosen nature" not by an expression of a special "heavenly protection," but by the terrible ordeal to which the ageless Yahweh subjected "His people." "The concept of selection consists entirely of humility and not arrogance. Selection is a burden and not a favor." It remains to add that these words belong to A. Eban, who, as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel, professed and conducted an open, aggressive course against Arab countries and thus demonstrated what "humility and an absence of arrogance" means in fact for Zionist rulers.

Another direction of the modernization consists of the attempts not only to camouflage the disassociation of the Jews from surrounding peoples, which necessarily stems from the dogma, but also, in the face of all logic, to depict this disassociation by means of . . . a rapprochement of the "chosen people" with all mankind. For example, J. Kaplan, the chief rabbi of France, prophesies that "Israel's calling according to the Sacred Book is to become the teacher of people and to bring them an understanding of God and the Sacred Law." But having arbitrarily ascribed to Israel (and "Israel" in such instances means a certain mythical "world Jewish nation") the calling of the mentor of mankind, the clerical figure did not remove, but reinforced the pernicious spirit of nationalistic arrogance.

The dogma of the Messiah ("the Lord's Anointed") also is subjected to specific interpretation for the purpose of reinforcing the ideological foundations of Zionism. The biblical image of the Messiah, which is depicted by the Old Testament as an individual from the tribe of King David, sometimes is cast aside and replaced by a very reactionary concept of the "messianic" purpose of the entire "chosen people." "Messianism," wrote the well-known ideologist of contemporary Judaism, G. Sholem, "takes in the entire Israeli people, becoming free of individual character, since it is the entire people of Israel who must prepare to atone for ancient sins." The Old Testament Messiah thus loses both the corporeal attributes and the supernatural function of an emissary of Yahweh, which is "concretized" by the "messianization of the entire chosen people."

We will note in passing that the most substantial dogmatic difference between Christianity and Judaism is determined by the "teaching" about the Messiah. According to Christian views, the Messiah in the person of Jesus Christ already has come to Earth and will return again at a fixed time, acting as the savior of the entire human race, while according to Judaic ideas, Yahweh will send down his anointed only in the future and only to deliver prosperity "to his own people."

International Zionism abroad long ago subordinated Judaic clerical centers to itself. The profound and all-encompassing mutual penetration of Zionist and Judaic ideas permitted Zionist author D. Catarivas to remark with tender emotion that in Israel "archaeologists roam the country with Bible in hand to investigate its depths, officers in the Israeli Army study a course on strategy with Bible in hand, and members of parliament prepare their speeches with Bibles in hand while geological explorers look for oil."

If Israeli parliamentarians like to draw inspiration from the "book of books" and it appears to geologists that pouring over it is a guarantee for increasing their country's oil resources, this is a strictly internal matter for them. But in those instances where Israel's rulers attempt to disseminate a biblical vision of public life to the sphere of interstate relations and when they strive to justify their policy of annexation of foreign lands and the policy of genocide against Palestinians by heavenly postulates of the god Yahweh, such a utilitarian-consumer's attitude toward Judaism turns into aggression.

Former Israeli premier D. Ben-Gurion willingly took up the biblical myth covered with the mold of centuries. Even before the establishment of Israel, he proclaimed: "The Bible is our mandate." And this "mandate" "secured" for the "chosen people" lands from the Nile to the Euphrates. The present Prime Minister, M. Begin, also pursues that same "tradition." During an official ceremony in the United States on 26 March 1979 on the occasion of the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli "peace" treaty, he included a biblical psalm in his speech, assuming not without grounds that this would generate tender emotion both in Sadat, a devout Moslem partner in the plot against the Arabs, and particularly in the Christian--President Carter.

The right to an independent existence and security of all states in the Near East, including Israel, as well as the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, including the formation of their own sovereign state, are indisputable. But these rights stem from international juridical norms and appropriate UN resolutions. But to seek a key to the solution of burning problems of modern times in biblical text of the slaveholding era is like a person who, intending to study the design of an ultrahigh speed racing car, arms himself with the model of an antediluvian coach.

Judaism now is gripped in a deep and irreversible crisis in all industrially developed countries. The Zionist authors of a book entitled "Judaism" published recently in Paris state bitterly that this religion "is retreating step by step under the blows of industrial civilization, retaining only a few small islands." But while the Zionists and clergymen write about the degradation of Judaism in the West with quiet sorrow, it gives way to wild indignation as soon as the talk turns to a decline of the Jewish religion in the USSR.

It is not the "persecution" of Judaism, of which the Zionists ill-meaningly accuse Soviet authorities, which is the basis of this decline, but the history of new, socialist social relationships and the party's steadfast concern for developing a scientific-materialistic outlook in all Soviet citizens. Recent sociological studies have shown that in the 1970's the number of believers in the Russian Federation and the Ukraine was from 3 to 6 percent of the total number of the Jewish population, and in the Baltic it was some 5 to 9 percent, with the enormous majority of these people being elderly.

It should be emphasized that, having taken up the transposition of biblical myth to the language of politics, the Zionist ringleaders act in this manner out of far from pious motives, but in the attempt to obtain very specific political dividends: to use Judaism as a certain uniting factor for the "supraclass consolidation of the world Jewish nation"; to attach a "sacred" meaning to the annexationist schemes of the Israeli ruling clan; to tune to the frequency of antisovietism a certain portion of the believers in foreign countries, and not only Jews, but Christians as well; and to disrupt the progressive process of accustoming Jews to the culture of peoples of the countries in which they live by imposing the "elevated values of Judaism."

But attempts to transfer theological myths of ancient times into the 20th century is clear proof of the historical doom of international Zionism and of its efforts to hinder the cause of strengthening peace and friendship among nations.

6904

CSO: 1800

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

Sept. 23, 1980